

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

CHRISTINE D. HAUCK,

Plaintiff,

v.

PHILLIP D. WALKER, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C13-5729 BHS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Christine Hauck's ("Hauck") motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 28).

On February 25, 2014, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. Dkt. 18. On March 31, 2014, the Court granted the motion. Dkt. 28. On April 8, 2014, Hauck filed a motion for reconsideration. Dkt. 28.

Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule CR 7(h), which provides as follows:

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.

1 Local Rule CR 7(h)(1).

2 Although Hauck raises numerous issues, she fails to show that reconsideration is
3 warranted. For example, Hauck argues that the Court should have granted her leave to
4 amend her complaint instead of dismissing her claims. Dkt. 28 at 4. Defendants,
5 however, moved for summary judgment, which requires an evaluation of the facts
6 submitted in support of each position instead of the allegations contained in the
7 complaint. Hauck's failure to submit facts sufficient to create a question of fact on the
8 issues of whether Defendants violated her constitutional rights was dispositive of these
9 issues and leave to amend would not cure such a deficiency. Moreover, Hauck "disputes
10 Defendants' assertions the submitted warrant [for her arrest] is a true and accurate copy."
11 Dkt. 28 at 6. Hauck alleges that "Defendants altered the warrant to influence the court on
12 Deputy Walker's credibility." *Id.* Unsupported allegations do not create a question of
13 fact, and there is no dispute that a warrant issued for Hauck's arrest on two felony
14 charges. Hauck fails to show that the Court made a manifest error of law in concluding
15 that execution of the warrant did not violate any of Hauck's constitutional rights.
16 Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Hauck's motion for reconsideration.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated this 9th day of April, 2014.

19
20 

21 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
22 United States District Judge